PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (see an example) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	The neurophysiological effects of dry needling in patients with upper trapeizus myofascial trigger points: study protocol of a controlled clinical trial
AUTHORS	Nakhostin Ansari, Noureddin; Abbaszadeh-Amirdehi, Maryam; Naghdi, Soofia; Olyaei, Gholamreza; Nourbakhsh, Mohammad Reza

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Prof.Dr. Josue Fernández Carnero.PT, MSc, PhD. Department of physicial therapy, Occupationa therapy, Rehabilitation and physical medicine. Facultad de CC. de la Salud (URJC) Avda. de Atenas s/n Campus de Alcorcón. 28922-Alcorcón (Madrid), Spain
REVIEW RETURNED	02-Apr-2013

THE STUDY	it´s not clear why do they include healthy subject as a conotrl group?, why don´t made a sham dry needling?
GENERAL COMMENTS	no comments, overall it´s must be accepted

REVIEWER	Lavelle, William Albany Medical Center
REVIEW RETURNED	02-Apr-2013

THE STUDY	The study is written well, but has actually not been completed. This is entirely a methods paper with no published results. Cant wait to see the results but I question if a methods paper with no results is good idea.
RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS	Again it is well written and well planned but no results are given
REPORTING & ETHICS	In the HTML version of the manuscript there are no results give. The methods of this paper are well written, but there are no results. I look forward to the results of this study.
GENERAL COMMENTS	Can you take this with no results????

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

1-The first line of the Introduction repeats 'Myofascial trigger points (MTrPs)'. On page 4, under title of "Introduction", line 1, we amended it.

2-Please define TENS in the Introduction. On page 5, para 2, line 4, we defined it.

3-At the end of the Introduction you should explain why you have decided to use a healthy control group as a comparison. This would also be a good place to state specific hypotheses. On page 5, para 2, line 11-17, we explained it. Hypotheses added.

4-Setting: add 'Iran' at the end. On page 6, we added it.

5-Informed consent: who will obtain this from the participants (please use participants, not patients)? How will they do it, and when? On page 7, under title of "Informed consent", we explained it.

6-Participants: this section should also include the information in the 'Procedures' section. The information in the Procedures section should be moved here and the procedures section removed. We moved it (page 8, under title of "Recruitment").

7-Please add how the volunteers will be recruited, by whom and what consent process will apply. We explained it under title of "Recruitment"(page 8, para 1).

8-What strategies will you use to ensure that you obtain enough participants for the intervention and for the control? Under title of "Sample size" (page 12), line before "Statistical Analysis" (page 13), we explained it.

9-Do you have information on the sample size now? Without this, the manuscript is much weaker. We amended it (page 12, under title of "Sample size", line 3-6).

10-What concomitant care will be allowed? On page 12, before "Averse effects", line 1-2, we explained it.

11-What procedures will be in place for recording harms and/or adverse effects? On page 12, under title of "Adverse effects", we explained it.

12-Please state who will do the analysis. Will they be blinded in any way? Or will it be the same researcher as is administering the intervention? If so, this is another limitation that needs including. On page 13, under title of "Statistical Analysis", last three lines, we explained it.